

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 15, 2005, within the three-month period for response. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,353,870 to Mills in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,916 Kauffman, further in view of MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,279,046 to Armstrong. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) In view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,069 to Dye. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) and Dye in view of Armstrong. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,067 to Powderly. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) and Powderly in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,350 to Comp. Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) in view of common knowledge in the art. Claims 8-9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman, MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0000161 to Laity. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Kauffman and MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,383 to Arndt, further in view of common knowledge in the art. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Powderly. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills and Powderly in view of Comp. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

Page 7 of 16
Serial No. 10/020,601
Amendment and Response dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005
IBM Docket ROC920010236US1
WHA&E IBM/208
E:\User\1206\Amendment and Response re 6-15-05 OA.wpd

being unpatentable over Mills, Powderly and Comp. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills and Powderly in view of MochaPocketTN5250 (Item B.S.) further in view of Comp. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills and Powderly in view of Handspring ("Development kit for Handspring Handheld Computers Release 1.0," 1999, Handspring). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills and Powderly in view of Kauffman. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills and Powderly in view of Laity. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills, Powderly and Laity in view of Arndt. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Powderly.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they are maintained.

Now turning to the subject Office Action, and specifically to the rejection of independent claim 1, this claim generally recites a method of managing a logical partition on a logically-partitioned computer. The method includes connecting a handheld computer to an adapter on the logically-partitioned computer via a plug-in module coupled to the handheld computer and connected to the adapter via a cable, and configuring the handheld computer to emulate a console for a logical partition in the logically-partitioned computer using program code resident in the plug-in module.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on the combination of Mills, Kauffman, and MochaPocketTN5250. The Examiner argues that Mills discloses a plug-in expansion card for a handheld computer, that Kauffman discloses providing a console in a logically-partitioned computer, and that MochaPocketTN5250 discloses console emulation software for a handheld computer.

A prima facie showing of obviousness requires that the Examiner establish that the differences between a claimed invention and the prior art "are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art." 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Such a showing requires that

all claimed features be disclosed or suggested by the prior art, along with objective evidence of the suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine or modify prior art references, as "[c]ombining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing

"*in hindsight*" In re Dembicak

BEST AVAILABLE COPY